

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and request reconsideration.

Applicant respectfully notes that the Advisory Action did not address any of Applicant's remarks and that Applicant respectfully requests that if the claims are not allowed that Applicant's remarks be addressed.

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams. In the "Response to Arguments" section of the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that it appears that the claims are being interpreted to be inconsistent with the Specification and that the words "substantially the same diameter" are not being given their ordinary meaning and instead is being given a meaning contrary to the Specification and understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art. If the rejections are maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing of a teaching in the relevant art that states that substantially the same diameter of pipes or tubes are of a size such that one fits inside the other since the Specification does not support such an interpretation, and the cited reference does not state this. The office action offers no factual support for the allegation that substantially the same diameter actually means a diameter that are different enough so that one element can fit inside another.

For example, the Specification refers to a pipe having the same diameter as a respective chosen section of an inline section of the tube. In fact, the tube is cut at the section having the same diameter as the pipe. As set forth for example in page 3 of the Specification it is stated that the pipe and the inline section "has the same diameter of the pipe 2". In the example shown in the figure the section x2 prime has the same diameter as the pipe and therefore the component is cut at section x2 prime as shown. The connection means receives both the pipe and the same diameter section of the tube. Applicant respectfully submits that the "substantially same

diameter” when referring to two pipes would require that the two pipes do not fit inside one another but to the contrary are of the same diameter.

Adams describes a different approach where a pipe is actually designed to fit over a connector since the pipe and the connector have substantially different diameters. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider that a  $\frac{1}{4}$ ” diameter pipe and a  $\frac{1}{2}$ ” diameter pipe are substantially the same diameter since one can fit inside the other. This is what is taught in Adams. As such, if the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests documentary evidence supporting the position of the U.S. Patent Office since it appears to be inconsistent with the Specification and with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant respectfully notes that an interpretation that is inconsistent with the Specification is not proper. Applicant also respectfully submits that the teachings of a reference cannot be overlooked in an effort to render a claim unpatentable.

In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that the claims also require that the connection means is dimensioned to be joined to the tube component at a respective section and to enable connection to a pipe of substantially the same diameter. As such, the connection means is dimensioned to be joined to both the tubing component and the pipe. The office action cites a jubilee clip as allegedly corresponding to the claimed connection means. However, a jubilee clip as known in the art and as shown in the Adams reference is not adapted to connect to a pipe and a tube, but to the contrary, only makes contact with a single tube namely the exterior of hose 11 and as such, the Adams reference also fails to teach the claimed connection means.

As to claim 4, the claim requires, among other things, joining the selected connection means both to the tubing component at the selected section and to the pipe. As such, the claimed connection means is joined to both the tube and the pipe. In contrast, Adams teaches that the

jubilee clip, alleged to correspond to the claimed connection means, is only joined to the hose 11, and namely the outer surface of hose 11 (see FIG. 2). As such, the jubilee clip is not designed to, nor does it join to both a tubing component and a pipe. Accordingly, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 6, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance. In addition, this claim is in means-plus-function language and includes at least the claimed structure and equivalents thereof. One example of a means for connecting in Applicant's Specification includes a structure 3 having a plurality of locking rings on either end of the member. No such structure is taught or suggested in the cited reference and as such, this claim is also allowable at least for this reason as well. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The new claims are directed to other aspects set forth in the Specification and drawings and such structure is not taught or suggested by the cited reference for relevant reasons stated above. As such, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 12, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Telephone: (312) 609-7599  
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005